



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,140	12/02/2003	Juergen Heymann	34874-060 UTIL	5327
64280 7590 10/09/2007 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C. 9255 TOWNE CENTER DRIVE SUITE 600 SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			EXAMINER FRITZ, BRADFORD F	
			ART UNIT 2141	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,140

Applicant(s)

HEYMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Bradford F. Fritz

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/23/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reiche (6,092,196).

3. Regarding claim 1, Reiche disclosed receiving a termination uniform resource locator (URL) from a client relating to a terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d, *item 204*), the termination URL including an external session identifier (ESID) (*item 206*) identifying the terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d); storing a state related to the terminated web application session associated with the ESID (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d); receiving a request from the client for a new web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d); determining whether the request includes an identifier that corresponds to the ESID of the terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d, *step B*); and if the identifier corresponds to the ESID of the terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d), serving the

new web application session according to the state related to the terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d).

4. Regarding claim 2, Reiche disclosed wherein storing the state related to the terminated web application further includes storing the ESID identifying the terminated web application (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d).

5. Regarding claim 4, Reiche disclosed receiving an ESID in response to serving the new web application (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2b).

6. Regarding claim 5, Reiche disclosed receiving an ESID each time a new web application session is started (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2b).

7. Regarding claims 6 and 17, Reiche disclosed wherein the request includes a start URL (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2b).

8. Regarding claim 7, Reiche disclosed if the identifier does not correspond to the ESID of the terminated web application session, serving the new web application session in a startup mode (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2b).

9. Regarding claim 8, Reiche disclosed minimizing the state related to the terminated web application (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2b).

10. Regarding claim 9, Reiche disclosed storing the ESID in a table (column 10, lines 10-30 and Fig. 2c).

11. Regarding claims 10 and 16, Reiche disclosed determining whether the request includes an identifier that corresponds to the ESID of the terminated web application session further includes mapping the identifier to one or more ESIDs stored in the table (column 10, lines 10-30 and Fig. 2c).

12. Regarding claim 12, Reiche disclosed receiving a request from a client for a new web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a); determining whether the request includes an identifier that corresponds to an external session identifier (ESID) stored in a memory and identifying a terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d); if the identifier corresponds to the ESID of the terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d), serving the new web application session according to a state related to the terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d); and if the identifier does not correspond to the ESID of the terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2b), serving the new web application session in a startup mode (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2b).
13. Regarding claim 13, Reiche disclosed storing the state related to the terminated web application session (column 10, lines 10-30 and Fig. 2c).
14. Regarding claim 14, Reiche disclosed receiving the ESID from the client with a termination uniform resource locator (URL) (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 3, 11, 18, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiche in view of Buckingham (6,961,776).

17. Regarding claim 3, Reiche disclosed receiving the ESID from a portal used by the client (column 10, lines 10-30 and Fig. 2c).

However Reiche does not explicitly teach that the session identifier comes from a portal. Buckingham teaches wherein the session identifier comes from a portal (column 19, lines 45-60 and column 20, lines 10-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the portal features as taught by Reiche because both are from the same field of endeavor of managing web sessions and in order to maintain state information for a portal.

18. Regarding claims 11 and 20, Reiche disclosed wherein the ESID is generated by a session manager of the portal (column 10, lines 10-30 and Fig. 2c).

However Reiche does not explicitly teach that the session identifier comes from a portal. Buckingham teaches wherein the session identifier comes from a portal (column 19, lines 45-60 and column 20, lines 10-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the portal features as taught by Reiche because both are from the same field of endeavor of managing web sessions and in order to maintain state information for a portal.

19. Regarding claim 18, Reiche disclosed a portal configured to generate a external session identifier (ESID) related to a web application session, and further configured to send the ESID to a server (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2d); and a server platform hosting the server and having a memory configured to store a state associated

with the ESID and a mapping module configured to map a request for a new web application session to one or more ESIDs in the memory (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2c), the server platform being further configured to serve the new web application session in the state associated with one ESID if the request corresponds to the one ESID (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2a and 2b).

However Reiche does not explicitly teach that the session identifier comes from a portal. Buckingham teaches wherein the session identifier comes from a portal (column 19, lines 45-60 and column 20, lines 10-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the portal features as taught by Reiche because both are from the same field of endeavor of managing web sessions and in order to maintain state information for a portal.

20. Regarding claim 19, Reiche disclosed storing the state related to the terminated web application session (column 10, lines 26-50, Fig. 2d).

21. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Offerman et al. (WO 01/97012) in view of Lane et al. "Web Database Applications with PHP & MySQL", for the same reasons given in the International Search Report for (PCT/IB 03/06400).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

a. Dustan et al. (5,884,312), teaches saving session information in a cookie to allow a user to return to a previous session, given the session has not yet expired.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradford F. Fritz whose telephone number is 571-272-3860. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BF

BF



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER